DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 645 VT 016 941

TITLE	Cooperative Day of Planning VI.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	60p.; Report on the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (6th, Denver, Colorado, May 5-6, 1972)
AVAILABLE FROM	National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 425 13th Street, Suite 852, Washington, D.C. 20004
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; Career Education; *Cooperative Planning; Educational Legislation; *Planning Meetings; Program Evaluation; *Program Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The Sixth Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, held in Denver, Colorado, on May 5-6, 1972, was attended by representatives of 48 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and Puerto Rico. Major concerns included evaluations, activities within the six school-based career education models, legislation, and other advisory council interests. This report summarizes the discussions and presents texts of speeches delivered at the meeting. Previous Joint Meeting reports are available through the source of availability listed above and as VT 016 940 in this issue. (MF)

ED 068645

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING VI

A Report on the Joint Meeting of the
State and National Advisory Councils
on Vocational Education

VT016941

Denver, Colo.
May 5-6, 1972

COVER PHOTOS FROM LEFT TO RIGHT:

- Dr. Calvin Dellefield
- Mr. Lawrence Davenport
- Mr. Irwin MacKay
- Mr. Marvin Buckels
- Governor John Love
- Mr. Stowe Witwer

ED 068645

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING VI

A Report on the Sixth Joint Meeting of the State and National
Advisory Councils on Vocational Education
May 5-6, 1972, Denver, Colorado

CONTENTS

Introductions

Summary of Discussion on Areas of Mutual Concern

. Report from NACVE
  Summary of NACVE Activities
  Review of FY 1971 SACVE Evaluation Reports
  Legislation as viewed by NACVE and DOL

. Discussion Groups
  Panel on Concerns and Considerations of Evaluations
  Panel on the six OE School-Based Career Education Models
  Summary of SACVE Suggestions to USOE Relative to Career Education and Evaluation

Texts of Speeches

. Honorable John Love, Governor of Colorado
. Honorable Peter Dominick, U. S. Senator (Colorado)
. Mr. Peter Muirhead, Executive Deputy Commissioner, USOE
. Mr. Michael Russo, Acting Director, DVTE, USOE
. Mr. Reginald Petty, NACVE Staff
. Mr. Lawrence Davenport, NACVE Chairman

List of Delegates in Attendance

INTRODUCTIONS

COOPERATIVE DAY OF PLANNING VI

A Summary of the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, May 5-6, 1972
Denver, Colorado

INTRODUCTION

The State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, created by Congress through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, were designed as independent boards to advise on the planning, operation and evaluation of vocational education throughout the country. At the time of their creation, the State and National Advisory Councils agreed that it would be mutually beneficial to meet semi-annually to discuss major issues and exchange information and ideas. The first joint meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils was held in November, 1969, the second in May, 1970, the third in November, 1970, the fourth in April, 1971, and the fifth in November, 1971.

The Sixth Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils on Vocational Education was held in Denver, Colorado, on May 5-6, 1972. Attended by representatives of forty-eight States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa and Puerto Rico, the meeting basically focused on concerns and considerations of evaluations, activities within the six school-based career education models, legislation, and NACVE interests.

During the course of the year it has become most apparent that the SACVEs continue to progress at rapid rates. The sophistication with which the annual evaluation reports were developed, as well as the sustained interest of the Congressional Education committees attest to this fact.

With these points in mind, I hope this summary of activities will serve your best interests in following the progress of the SACVEs.

Calvin Dellefield
Executive Director
National Advisory Council

MR. MARVIN W. BUCKELS, VICE CHAIRMAN, COLORADO STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

My purpose in being here this morning is to welcome you to this conference and to welcome you to Colorado and Denver. I'm sorry the sun is not shining this morning and that we have a 30 percent chance of spring showers this afternoon, but it's always lovely in Denver. (I will give you the official Denver Chamber of Commerce position.)

I hope either during or after the conference you will have an opportunity to get acquainted with Denver, and to go up into the hills and see some of the most beautiful part of the United States. Even more importantly, perhaps, I hope you will have an opportunity to talk with some of the people from Colorado who are attending this conference, the lay people, the members of the Colorado Advisory Council and some of our staff.

We are very proud of what is going on in vocational education in the State of Colorado. We feel that the time has come for vocational education. We feel that we have been successful in communicating this fact to the Legislature and that we have gotten a good response from them. That is not to say that we ever get all the money we would like to have--we don't!

At lunchtime today you are going to hear from our Governor and, as a very partisan Democrat, let me tell you that we feel the support we have received for the cause of vocational education in this State from our Governor is all that could be asked. This man, as much as anybody, is responsible for the changes that have occurred in vocational education in this State in the last six or eight years.

We hope that in the conversations you might have with people from Colorado that you learn of the very unusual legal structure we have for administrating vocational education within this State. I'm sure it is unique. It has

caused some problems but I think it has opened the doors for some unique opportunities for utilization of vocational dollars (federal, state and local) to the betterment of the taxpayer and citizen.

We probably have in the State of Colorado the agency with the longest title of any Government organization in the country (Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education). Our responsibility is to administer the community colleges of the State of Colorado and all vocational education at all levels. In addition, we act as the educational agency for the manpower programs and we supervise some 110 proprietary schools. In this whole complex of diverse assignments, we think that we have been able to put together in a very meaningful way, far more positive utilization of effort in vocational education than existed before.

This has been particularly true in the smaller communities of the State where we have been able to develop within our community colleges campus vocational centers serving both secondary and post-secondary students. We get a far better utilization of our vocational facilities that way. We think we provide better education for secondary students, and by this fuller utilization of these facilities, we are able to justify placing Federal vocational dollars, for example, in the construction of facilities and equipment.

I recommend that you talk with Colorado people about how they view this experiment. The legal structure we know is unique, and we have also found that in talking to educators out of state, that they think we are wild. But I can assure you, at least from this prejudiced person's point of view, it does work.

I again welcome you to Denver and welcome to Colorado. We think what is happening here is good.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ON AREAS OF MUTUAL CONCERN

A REVIEW OF NACVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. Lawrence Davenport, Chairman of the National Advisory Council, reported that NACVE had been actively involved during FY 1971-72 in:

- providing information to Congress on vocational education concerning programs and enrollments
- urging Congress to appropriate adequate funds for the future for vocational education
- advising on career education programs and planning
- proposing solutions to employment problems of returning veterans
- making recommendations for career guidance and counseling
- sponsoring public information programs in career and vocational education
- providing technical assistance to SACVEs and coordinating State Advisory Council efforts with those of the National Council
- cooperatively engaging Federal agencies, as well as State and local organizations in projects aimed at improving and expanding occupational education training opportunities

(A complete text of Mr. Davenport's comments begins on page 60.)

NACVE REVIEW OF FY 1971 SACVE EVALUATION REPORTS

The evaluation reports of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education showed great concern and dedication on the part of the Councils and some progress in implementing changes in state programs. Past recommendations which were successfully implemented ranged from the initiation of a small technical-vocational administrator internship program in Texas to a substantial increase in funding and personnel in vocational guidance in Colorado. Distressingly, nine states did not present any information on success or failure in implementation of past recommendations, and some states reported less than satisfactory results.

The two most frequently mentioned topics in the 1971 recommendations were the need for more funds (24 states) and the desire to implement a comprehensive career education program (22 states). In the 1970 reports, the category which included funding was tenth. This change may reflect the disappointment of many State Councils with the level of funding provided this past year. Career Education as a separate topic did not appear in last year's tally. This new priority of the Office of Education, it seems, is being well and widely received. Counseling programs and information systems were items one and two in the 1970 tally. They were items three and four in the 1971 list of recommendations, showing consistent concern and continuing need in both areas. The fifth 1971 item was programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped, up from seventh place last year.

Placement and follow-up came in sixth both this year and last. Seventh in 1971 was in-service training for teachers and administrators, down from third rank in 1970.

Two items which were high on the list in 1970 and dropped way down in 1971 were evaluation (4th place to 17th) and planning (5th place to 10th). This could be a reflection of success in making improvements in these two important areas, an interpretation which would be in accord with references to progress elsewhere in many reports. However, 15 states mentioned that their State Plans were not yet satisfactory documents, many still lacked clearly stated goals and objectives, making evaluation of program success difficult.

Interpretation of the evaluation reports was complicated by the failure of over half of the State Councils to follow the suggested format. In some cases when data requested was not available the reports so declared. In other cases, however, the reports left out important information in a manner which seemed merely idiosyncratic. Consideration is being given to including a "Model Report" with the suggestions sent to the State Councils for their 1972 evaluation reports.

(A complete text of Mr. Petty's remarks are included in the section on speeches, page 56.)

LEGISLATION

NACVE has asked Congress for full funding of vocational education programs. In testimony before the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Labor-HEW, the Council requested $250 million over the Administration's budget request. The testimony was presented by David Van Alstyne, chairman of the NACVE budget committee, and senior partner of Van Alstyne, Noel & Co., Investment Bankers of New York City. Mr. Van Alstyne has been a state Senator in New Jersey, Speaker of the New Jersey House, and Chairman of its Appropriations Committee. Mr. Van Alstyne made an impromptu presentation on the testimony last week before the State Directors meeting in Washington which received a standing ovation, which is an indication of the importance and effectiveness of the appropriations testimony.

In its testimony, the Council also requested increased funding for the operations of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. The 1968 Vocational Education Amendments provide that State Councils received operating funds based on a percentage of the state's grant allotment, but the amount should not exceed $150,000 and not be less than $50,000. The state councils have never been fully funded, and under the fiscal year 1973 budget request of $2.6 million 37 states and territorial councils would receive less than the $50,000 minimum. NACVE urged the committees to appropriate $4.3 million for state councils, or $1.6 million over the budget request.

Lowell Burkett has pointed out that under the budget request as it now stands, 27 states would receive less in fiscal 1973 than they did last year for state grants. This is due to shifts in population as reflected by the 1970 census, which are now being used as the basis for state allocations.

The Manpower Development and Training Act was extended for one year when President Nixon signed the extension bill into law on February 25. The bill authorizes $750 million for vocational and job training programs for fiscal 1973. The extension was required to allow continuation of MDTA programs while Congress considers comprehensive manpower reform legislation.

The Senate-House conferees were meeting on the Higher Education Act and they accepted the Occupational Education Act, which was part of the House version of the bill, along with the Community College Development Program, which was in the Senate version. The Occupational Education Act is a $100 million program for fiscal 1973, increasing to $500 million in fiscal 1975, to promote quality post-secondary occupational education.

The National and State Advisory Councils will have the same responsibilities under the Occupational Education Act as they now have under the Vocational Education Act.

The conferees also approved the creation of a Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education in the Office of Education, headed by a Deputy Commissioner, at grade GS-18. The new Bureau will have jurisdiction over the new Occupational Education Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Adult Education Act, along with functions of OE relating to manpower training, and vocational and technical and occupational education in community and junior colleges.

The conferees also approved establishment of the National Institute of Education. They did not accept the establishment of a National Foundation for Post-Secondary Education, which was in the Senate version of the bill. But they did give the Secretary of HEW new authority to make grants to universities, institutions and other organizations to study innovations in higher education, along the lines contemplated in the bill.

The National Institute of Education will be headed by a Director, and will be co-equal with the Office of Education, headed by the Commissioner. Both will be under an Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education.

It appeared that the conferees may accept the Cranston Amendment, offered by the Senator from California and passed by the Senate as an amendment to the Higher Education Act. The House conferees seemed to be favorably inclined toward the amendment. Secretary Richardson said that HEW could abide by the terms of the amendment if it is accepted and included in the final version of the bill.

The amendment would affect the educational renewal strategy of the Office of Education and might require the dismantling of much of its recent reorganization. The educational renewal strategy has been an integral part of OE's "new look," and it has involved the transferring of funds from various programs to support it. Congress, by adoption of the Cranston amendment, is objecting to the education renewal strategy because it contends there is no authorization for it, that it is a full-scale program, not a pilot project as OE has contended. that it required proper Congressional authorization, and Congress contends that OE is "stealing money from duly authorized programs to support it."

The Cranston amendment authorizes $25 million for educational renewal, giving it the sanction of Congressional authorization, but it prohibits program consolidation and the transfer of funds from one program to another for uses not authorized by law.

If the concept of the Cranston amendment is accepted, it could affect $10.9 million in funds which are planned to be transferred from the Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education to the Education Renewal fund under the fiscal 1973 budget request.

A minimum wage bill will come to the House floor next week. The bill carries a minimum wage of $2 an hour, with no exemptions.

Congressman Erlenborn will offer an amendment to provide a reduced minimum wage of $1.60 for students and other youth under 21 years of age. This could have an important effect on vocational education work-study and cooperative education programs. It is suggested that State Advisory Councils, with its cross section of members from business, industry, labor, education, and the general public, look at this legislation and make appropriate recommendations to their Congressmen.

A Summary of Legislative Remarks by Richard Wise, Executive Assistant to the Under Secretary of Labor:

Minimum Wage legislation was being considered by Congress. One of the bills introduced by Congressman Erlenborn, provides a youth differential. The youth differential would provide that students up to age 21, and other youth up to age 18 receive 80 percent of the established minimum wage. In other words, if the minimum wage is raised to $2, the youth differential would make the minimum wage for youth $1.60.

Youths generally are not able to compete with older workers for most jobs, so the stated purpose of the differential is to try to give them a little better chance to hold onto entry level jobs, unskilled jobs, and part time jobs.

It is anticipated that the $2 minimum wage will have a significant job displacement effect. An employer may try to get the job done through mechanization, or to eliminate jobs entirely if they are not high productivity jobs. He may try to eliminate his part time jobs.

This is especially important in view of the unemployment figures for young people. The overall unemployment figure is 5.9 percent, but for youth in general, it is 17.9 percent, and for black youth, 35.5 percent.

The jobs that the differential would encourage employers to retain and develop are those that would be available for young people. There is a precedent for this. Thirty-five states provide a lower minimum wage for learners, for beginning or entry level employees. Twenty-two states have a lower differentiation for students, and eleven states have a lower differentiation for those under 18.

This is also true in European countries. Recently, Senator Horace Menasco, the Wage and Hours Administrator to Europe, was asked to look into their system to determine if by legislation or through collective bargaining agreements the European countries take cognizance of the needs of young people by providing a lower wage scale for them.

EVALUATION

A panel discussion on the content, methodology, procedure and format of evaluation activities produced the following impressions:

- Mr. William Ball, Executive Director, Montana SACVE:
  - SACVE guidelines, with assistance of BAVTE, help to determine who should perform evaluations
  - preference for on-going, progress type of evaluation as opposed to evaluation at the end of programs

- Dr. Duane Lund, Chairman, Inter-Governmental Committee, NACVE:
  - evaluation should have as its purpose a better system of vocational education in each respective state
  - each state should decide whether evaluations will contain quantitative or qualitative emphasis, or both
  - improvement of data collection systems is vital to present evaluation procedures
  - Congress is most concerned about procuring accurate evaluation feedback on the effects of the Vocational Education Amendments

- Mr. Douglas Fellows, Chairman, Connecticut SACVE:
  - present Federal and State guidelines hinder equalitative evaluation
  - SACVE evaluations reflect an over-reliance on statistical data and not the meanings behind such figures
  - evaluations ignore the social aspect of the end product, the students being served in vocational education

- Dr. Norman Stanger, Chairman, Planning and Evaluation Committee, NACVE:

  The panel chairman summarized the suggestions of National and State Advisory Council members to:

- utilize school facilities during summer months to promote year-round useage of educational institutions
- develop questionnaires to determine parental attitudes toward vocational education
- establish more youth organizations for student involvement in consumer areas
- design evaluations to focus more readily on student needs
- encourage collective participation of communities in devising vocational education programs
- involve professional organizations, as well as business and industry in the educational process
- apply SACVE perspectives as a uniquely important contribution to evaluation activities
- develop programs to meet needs of minority communities on the basis of individual resources
- determine SACVE effectiveness in terms of re-focusing vocational education in light of career education development

CAREER EDUCATION

A panel discussion on the status of the six USOE school-based models resulted in the following remarks:

- Dr. Fred Dyer, Jefferson County School System:
  - the Jefferson County school-based model maintains an integrated team of members from the school district and the OCVTE to develop curriculum guides
  - a sub-contract has been let to develop a comprehensive prototype placement program for K-12 in the guidance area
- Mr. Charles McDaniel, Chairman, Georgia SACVE:
  - the curriculum development project should result in an end product, as well as providing a number of procedures for carrying out replication of the model
  - respective SACVEs and State departments of education should be integrally involved with USOE in the development of these six career education models
  - project is primarily a curriculum development model
- Mr. Karl Kolb, Executive Direct, California SACVE:
  - the Los Angeles school-based model was chosen in part for its 60 percent Spanish-speaking enrollment that represents some 32 nationalities at Belmont High School
  - the Institute for Educational Development is providing informative input to the model, and may carry out a summative evaluation at the end of the project
  - only Los Angeles model site provides for a full-time public information and involvement representative
  - model is a full-time curriculum development project
- Mr. Gus Shaw, Chairman, Arizona SACVE:
  - the Mesa school-based model project is a centralized program involving some 53 schools

- the Mesa model is unique in that it is funded by Federal, State and local sources

- a contract has been given to develop a needs assessment program for job opportunities and necessary work experiences

- Mr. Bill Helmstaedter, Consultant, USOE:

  - project involves a racial and social mix of students

  - model maintains a contract with Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education to provide sequential and continuous coverage for curriculum development

  - recommendation has been made for a follow-up study of student perceptions in using career development data

- Mr. Joe Tuma, Chairman, Michigan SACVE:

  - Pontiac school-based model site reflects the multitude of variables which represent the United States at large

  - career education will not be a successful program without the popular support and leadership of the communities

  - career education requires broader thinking of the vocational educators

  - the career education models are not ends in themselves nor should they limit the possibilities of this educational concept

SUMMARY of SACVE SUGGESTIONS to USOE RELATIVE to CAREER EDUCATION and EVALUATION

The round-table discussions produced the following recommendations from each group:

GROUP I: (Louis Licari, Ray Miller, Walter Penrod, Margaret Kraetzli, Dorothy Means, F. C. Morrison, A. J. Moynihan, Vernon Exner, and Charles Newton)

- USOE should invite a SACVE representative to participate in regional meetings planned to develop new state plan guidelines
- SACVE executive directors should be invited to participate in USOE sponsored meetings with State Directors of Vocational Education
- minimum funding of all SACVEs, according to law, is necessary
- funds for career education should be derived from a variety of sources within the Office of Education, not just from vocational areas

GROUP II: (Leo Renaud, Joe Clary, Thomas King, Dick Collins, Ken Oakleaf, Virginia Vieregg, Frank Peterson, Benny Curtis, George Allen and A. Knapp)

- need for follow-ups with students, business and industry
- need for coordination of follow-up studies
- need for more involvement of business and industry in program planning
- career education must have strong support from all levels and sources
- evaluations should allot more space to indicating career education activities in the States
- the recycling concept is essential to the implementation of career education

GROUP III: (Caroline Hughes, John Briscoe, George Elison, T. Enright, Jim Zancanella, Garland Puzey, Richard Baker, Gus Shaw, and David Thompson)

- teachers should be involved in SACVE evaluation processes

- evaluation should be a continuous activity
- SACVEs should define types of needed services
- should SACVEs be evaluating resources utilization or program effectiveness?
- since SACVEs cannot produce in-depth quantitative studies, Councils should continue to look at targets and render judgments
- SACVEs should be concerned with the general public's reactions to personnel at the State level

GROUP IV: (Billy Bruns, Roy Stewart, Margaret Nielsen, Reid Ross, Bill Kanyek, Carl Bloskovich, Jr., F.R. Vihel, Wesley Lambert, Leo Breeden, Elton Thomas, Gordon Kutscher)

- career education is a process, not a product, whereby decision-making is fostered
- without total involvement of community resources, career education becomes a synonym for vocational education
- goals on changing attitudes are related to skill measurements
- originators of career education should explain the concept fully at the next SACVEs/NACVE joint session

GROUP V: (Linda Skaar, George Schaffer, Phyllis Dixon, J. Duncan, R. Putnam, Ivan Million, Roy Craig, Art Shack, Richard Brown, Harlan Giese, L. Pio, Robert Skinner)

- study career education efforts in States other than those of the model sites to avoid duplication
- the career education concept needs to be more widely promoted for purposes of increasing public understanding
- implementation of career education should involve other personnel besides just professional types
- career education requires funding from all sources
- evaluation guidelines should include aspects of quality

- a comparative report on vocational education should be made by the States for use in all States

GROUP VI: (George DeLong, Robert Rahill, Rodney Hale, Jack Gunderson, T. Manion, Jim Andersen, Richard Prows, Fred Tarbox, Richard Shelton, Robert White)

- statistics must be considered a source of information upon which decisions can be made
- a standardized reporting system from USOE is needed
- state plan guidelines are too rigid in that they are not applicable to small communities
- guidance areas in education have been too college-oriented

GROUP VII: (Paul Goldsmith, Carolyn Parker, Henry Morgan, C. Draper, D. McDonald, Orbra Hulsy, Clint Harris, Harold Noddin, Isaac Williams, Pelton Goudey, Jon Krug, Fred Hinckley, Emmett See, George Ikeda, Jo Messlin)

- evaluations reflect extent to which last year's goals were achieved, plans for the coming year, and the Councils' role in assessing a new state plan
- vocational-technical aspect of career education is being played down by USOE
- more AFL-CIO representation should be established in NACVE and SACVEs

GROUP VIII: (Max Blackham, Wallace Fletcher, Karl Kolb, Fred Hoke, Bert Bradford, Bill Ball, James Murray, George Gwan, Joe Renders, Norman Taylor, Mike Arnett)

(No remarks were submitted by this discussion group.)

GROUP IX: (Ernest Gibson, Lanny Hassell, Warren Weiler, Joe Hall, Charles Tyler, Mary Murray, J. Helmstaedster, Max Jobe, Mac Terry, Jim Castleberry, Chalmers Cromer, Peter Eissele)

- career education should be funded from all sources, not just with vocational education monies
- if career education is to be successfully implemented, USOE will have to provide more effective leadership for that purpose
- pouring of dollars into one school-based model will not fuse career education into a national program
- career education has still not been defined

Mr. Lanny Hassell, Executive Director of the Arkansas SACVE summarized the major points of agreements on evaluation and career education that were reported in the group discussions. Primary concerns of the SACVEs included:

- vocational education must not assume the total financial or organizational responsibility for career education
- more equitable distribution of resources must be sought by USOE to assist non-college bound students
- in order for vocational education to become an effective partner in the career education concept, more facilities, equipment and teachers will be required
- USOE must not only provide effective leadership for career education but be prepared to put its support on the line with the Administration and Congress to insure its success financially
- major impact of career education will never be felt until the academic community meets the issue and embraces the concept
- assurances should be made to insure that career education will not develop into a track system
- SACVEs cannot work for career education until they have an accurate definition of the concept
- without total involvement of all education, career education becomes a synonym for vocational education

- USOE should be prepared to explain in detail the ramifications of career education at the November joint session of Councils in Washington

- SACVE evaluations should involve both qualitative and quantitative aspects

- in-depth analysis of the plan is hindered by general plan complexities and assessment requirements

- under the current system of evaluation, SACVEs regard their plans as progress reports

- follow-up studies should be conducted to assess feelings of students as to the accuracy and relevancy of the education they have received

- USOE should involve individuals from SACVEs when developing State plan guidelines

- full funding of SACVEs is necessary if they are to carry out their responsibilities, as mandated by Congress

- SACVEs need the input of lay people in the evaluation process

- Councils should be primarily concerned with policy implementation as it affects various programs

- since in-depth analysis and evaluation is impossible, SACVEs should target certain areas for study as part of an over-all general evaluation

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Don Cargill, Executive Secretary of the Georgia SACVE, will serve as the new Chairman of the NACVE/SACVEs Ad Hoc Committee.

TEXTS OF SPEECHES

THE HONORABLE JOHN A. LOVE, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

It is with pleasure that I extend my own welcome, and the cordial welcome of all the people of Colorado to you today, for it has become increasingly apparent that vocational education is our primary educational imperative and goal, both now and in the years ahead.

As a matter of fact, both critics and friends have distinguished me as a product of vocational education--in that prior to my first election to the office of Governor in 1962, I had held no other elected office. During my first term, I held meetings all over the State, seeking always to find what it was the people of Colorado felt to be lacking in State government, what the challenges were, and where the opportunities lay. In the years since that time, I have often reflected upon the fact that so many of the wishes of our people in 1963 have been incapable of accomplishment or altered by events; but I cannot help but be pleased that, in the years intervening, so many of our dreams, hopes and proposals have become reality. The measure of success we have had I attribute largely to the excellent on-the-job training given me by the people who elected me.

Currently, the first mandate of government--in Colorado, in the West, and it seems to me nationally--is the opportunity we have to help channel our growing numbers into productivity.

In no area is this challenge more fundamental than in education. Long ago I came to the conclusion that the educational establishment--and "establishment" is the proper term, since education is not only the largest provider of services in the United States, as well as the biggest business--cannot as it is now constituted, meet the needs of an expanding, and increasingly mobile population.

When, in thirty short years, we in Colorado have a population not of two million, but four million people, and when also in the year 2000, we will, in all logic, be educating twice as many young people as we are now, we shall

have to educate those young people differently, and measure their education differently, or they will get increasingly inadequate education, and we will have no way to improve it.

It is both fashionable, and necessary, to talk about the crisis in education. The current state of the economy is a case in point; the areas of new unemployment created by the recent tight job situation are within such industries as aerospace, and you are, as I am, aware of the difficulties in teacher placement. Engineers have been laid off in near-record numbers; Ph.D.'s are not working, or are working outside their specialties. Yet we witness daily the tragedy of young people who drift, rather than go, to college because they can find nothing else to do. This situation is doubly tragic because, if present trends continue, they will find even less to do, many of them, when they graduate.

But there are jobs; and at a point in time in which, contrary to all logic, opportunity, employment, and unemployment rise together, we face, in real fact, a crisis in education and expectations. The problem has been well defined by Dean Cohen of Clark University who recently noted, "the process of continually increasing the number of students in schools and colleges, without the corresponding expansion of traditional career lines to accommodate these expanding numbers. The disciplines have served professional careers directly, and have been the vehicle around which curriculum has been organized for this purpose--but the non-career bound student has been locked out of the process."

I would add that the American people have traditionally regarded education as the cure for all evils, just as for a long time we regarded growth as in and of itself good. The eventual result of our view of growth was creation of our problems of population concentration and density. So, also, have we regarded more and more education as better simply because it was bigger.

During my years in public office we have learned that growth is not of necessity good; through our Land Use Commission, we have given local government the power and planning tools to inhibit growth where it is not needed, and reserved to the State the right to preclude growth where growth is both dangerous and of such impact as to be beyond the jurisdictional power of local government. We have also taken a new look at education--and, in the area of vocational education, we effected a 429% increase in State appropriation during the previous three years.

The reasons for this dramatic increase are many. The figure of increase represents a considerable shift in the philosophy of the legislative and executive branches of government, whereby we came to the realization that vocational education has, as its object, the matching of students and jobs. A poll in Denver in 1971 among school budget advisory boards, recognized the vitality of the work to be done; of 130 committees reporting, vocational education was, from among 41 categories, selected as top-priority in the poll

for junior and senior high schools, and as third in importance for elementary schools. And these committees were composed not just of educators--each was, according to the news media, composed of the principal, two teachers, two parents, and three citizens. In some cases students were included.

The taxpayers--the ultimate constituents for any school program--are making themselves heard; they and their children want vocational education, and they're going to get it.

It is an oversimplification to say that vocational education consists in the matching of people and non-professional jobs; yet it is true that such occupations meet, and increasingly surpass, the rewards of the professions in terms of affluence. It is increasingly true, and widely recognized, that a college degree is not a ticket to success; that a student with a college degree can be, and often is, at a relative disadvantage for a given job when compared with a more suitably trained, vocationally-oriented student. Employers are--to speak bluntly--less and less inclined to buy college degrees when those degrees bear, as they too often do, little or no relationship to the requirements of the job to be filled. And we are seeing, for the first time in our history, a crisis in employment which has struck first, and hardest, at the professional classes. This is a lesson which has not been lost on employers, who now seek the willingness to work, rather than the complete professional, in a new employee.

A revolution in education is taking place around us; a growing realization that schools which regard themselves as only preparatory schools for colleges and universities are not doing their job. The school counselor whose only measure of achievement is how many students he channels to college placement has neglected substantially more than half his students; the school board which measures counselors only by how many students attend college is simply unaware of the job the counselor must do.

It is common, for instance, to regard the drop-out--whether he drops out of high school or college, as an educational failure, a discredit to his school system. But if the student who drops out finds a job, is satisfied with it, gives satisfaction to his employer and is a good citizen--isn't that drop-out to be counted as an educational <u>success</u>, rather than a failure? Why should any young person who succeeds in the imperatives of American life--productivity and good citizenship--be listed a failure because he chose not to complete a given course, or a given number of years in school?

If he is a credit to his community and to himself, we have no business to list him as a failure, or to regard him as having failed because he did not meet the arbitrary standards of a frequently impersonal system. In fact, we measure the job schools do incorrectly, because we measure individual students incorrectly.

To know of a high school, for instance, that in a given year a given total number of students attended, and that, of that total, a certain number of them went on to college, and a certain number dropped out, and a certain number got their diplomas and sought no further schooling, is fundamentally meaningless. The meaningful statistics for that school, and the way in which to measure that school, is to discover how many of the students who went to college later went to work; how many of the drop-outs found and kept jobs; and how many of the students who graduated but did not continue their education looked for work and found it. In these terms, it is impossible to discover how good a job a school did in 1972 until 1974 or 1975--but it is vital, at that point, to know.

What education is supposed to do for young people has been fiercely debated for centuries, and is fiercely debated now. It is impossible to define education, but surely we can say that if education does not help to equip people to realize the fullness of living, and does not shape behavior so as to instill the discipline of work, it has failed us. Any school system which exists only as the sort of half-way house between the years of irresponsible childhood and the concept of productivity has failed its students. Any school which teaches, or counsels, its students that meaningful achievement is only gained in the professions becomes a half-way house. We cannot afford, nor will the taxpayers support, schools which cannot be held accountable in terms of real productivity.

Vocational education, from the elementary school on, is the most immediately practical, well tested education method of which productivity is both the objective and the measurement--and is, as the result, the program most in demand in the public schools.

But vocational education is much more than the means to an end; it is a revolutionary reversal of attitudes, the beginning of a set of values. It retains its originality when we welcome into the teaching profession the person whose expert knowledge of his field has been acquired on the job, not in school. This lack of formality is vital if we are to avoid rigidity--and the recognition of equivalent work experience avoids rigidity.

Together we seek to redefine, to reshape, the educational experience. If we can say that the unemployed dropout is an educational success, then we force the recognition that the unemployed, or unemployable, college graduate is an educational failure. For many years it has been true that the unintended effect of more and more education, made available to more and more people, has been to postpone, to delay, decision making--and in the process, to distort the decision-making process itself, within the educational establishment and among students, into a blind faith that entry to the professions is a guarantee of success, and that the professions themselves represent the only way of earning a respectable living.

I contend that this is wrong, socially and educationally. We need technicians, and a student working with molten metal is learning molecular theory. There is no reason why the career decision cannot be made far earlier than it is now--except the prejudice which sustains the feeling that the longer a student stays in school, the more likely he is, simply by virtue of the number of years put in, to enter a profession. Too few people know that 80 percent of the occupations in America do not require a bachelor's degree--or we would not have a situation in which it is predicted that by 1980 half our young people will be seeking bachelor's degrees. If it is true that a democracy depends on its economics, and that school systems should reflect the facts of economics, then we have greatly overbuilt the terminal point of education, and neglected the child. And when we neglect the child--when we build a system that encourages him to postpone, rather than make, decisions, then we have failed our children. There is no more fundamental failure, and we must avert it.

In Colorado we have brought vocational education within the reach of 95 percent of the people this year, in the schools, the community colleges, and the vocational education centers. We could not have sought this goal without the massive public support which vocational education has had, and continues to have in the State.

And we must measure the student, not the school. We must follow the progress of each young person leaving school, and entering the community of citizens, in order to discover how effective our schools really are. We must attack the prejudice that the only rewarding work done in this country is done by people in white collars, and we must reverse the attitude of those teachers and counselors whose philosophy of upward-bound means only college bound. We must help young people and their parents to expand their definition of productivity to include the total of meaningful work done in America. We must help students to make decisions earlier than they do now, and help the school community to educate with skills in mind, and to emphasize jobs, rather than college placement.

We have, together, begun to reverse the law of social gravity which has heretofore dictated that dollars gravitate to the highest level of education.

Together, as we face the immeasurable burden of being ready, as a state-wide community, for twice our population, let us take productivity as our guide, and prepare young people for the jobs that actually exist, rather than adding to the frustrations which are increasingly expressed as our students realize what, in realistic terms, they face--the danger of unemployment due to over-education, and over-specialization.

Wisdom and prudence dictate, in all areas of human life, that opportunity and achievement must coincide, and that natural resources must not be wasted.

Our most precious natural resource is our children, and in order that their lives not be wasted, we must ensure that they learn to do what it is realistically possible for them to do.

You have dedicated yourselves to a learning process which recognizes reality. We are pledged to assist you in every way we can, and together we shall find the new accountability, the new level of responsibility, which results from providing our children with the full, wide range of their many options.

Thank you.

SENATOR PETER H. DOMINICK, (R-COLO.)

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

Well, I think you can see why I said during that whole campaign that the only thing better than Joe would be Holly.

Holly, I can't tell you what fun it is to be here with you. This is the first time I think that I have been formally introduced by you and you can do it anytime.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is good to be here with you; it is good to be here after the five weeks of sessions that we have had in the Higher Education Conference up to date. It's been a long and difficult bill. It isn't by any means through yet and I will get into it a little bit later.

I have a long, and what I think will be a rather tedious speech to give it as a whole, and I'm not going to; I'm going to paraphrase it a little bit and give you some of the highlights of it and hopefully put it in order so that if any of you want a copy of it later, you can have it.

What I would like to say is to start with that a number of years ago, you couldn't find anybody in the educational world who wasn't in favor of continuing the structure of education from the time a person was four years or younger, all the way through four years of college and probably in graduate school, too.

I think some of that college and graduate school was obviously based on the draft situation, and nevertheless, it was a fact of life; it was a kind of psychological fact of life that was carrying on from one generation to another. There is still a great deal of it in this country.

Recently, when we had a provision to try and renew the draft, hoping to get to a voluntary army later, I talked to a great number of people in the educational world. Without exception, all of them said, "Don't give any exemptions to those who are going to college," which was a total shift from what it had been four years ago.

In the process of that discussion with the variety of educators, I also ran into a very prominent man from Ohio who, to my great delight, was moving as an educator in Colorado, who had given a course in the Ohio secondary schools. One of the things that he was teaching was that before anybody went to college, you ought to have at least three years off, to make sure this is what you want to do. And in the process of that, to do something in the way of working to show that the quality of work itself was helpful to anybody's own dignity, and to his ability and to continue to support himself and his family, if he had one at that time.

I don't think anybody in our State that I know, and probably not in very many others, had actually been teaching courses at that point on the necessity of breaking up their educational career to try and build in what you call either a work ethic or what you call, if you want to, which I think is a more important phrase, the diversity of the educational process, including in that the fact of work itself.

I gave a speech on this before the Librarians' Association, not being quite sure how it would come out, and saying personally that I thought it was something that we ought to work on very hard. In the process of that, accentuating the need for vocational education, community colleges, occupational skills and so on. It was received very well, and a number of organizations asked for copies of it, which I got to them.

Today, I am not going to repeat that because obviously all of you here are in favor of it. But, what I want to do today, if I may, is to go into some of the structures that we have been trying to provide at the Federal level to be of assistance to all of you who are so deeply engrossed in this vocational and occupational education process.

I want to start out by saying that dealing as I am with two advisory committees, I can say to you that in general I'm not one of the strong supporters of advisory committees. As a matter of fact, I happen to be the author of an amendment which asks that the Secretary of HEW on Health Advisory Committees and the Commissioner of Education on Education Advisory Committees, review the power of these committees and their accomplishments, and for heaven's sake to get rid of those who aren't doing anything except providing patronage jobs.

I hope, watching what is going on in our Committee over the previous time, although this study hasn't been complete, so that we can eliminate almost as many as new ones that we are putting through. I have never seen such a proliferation of advisory committees in my life. I can say, that the National Committee and our State Advisory Committee here on Vocational Education has really been doing a superlative job. These are two that I am willing to fight for in trying to keep in operation. I think you have done a terrific job.

Having started that way, I will start by pointing out that the National and State Advisory Councils are not only effective and active, but they coordinate their activities. This was of enormous importance.

One of the problems we have had with Advisory Committees is the fact that the National Committee will go one way, and the State will go another and never the twain shall meet until they finally hit head-on.

But the annual report that was issued by the National Council recently, which was short and effective, has been very, very gratifying as far as I'm concerned and I'm sure to those other supporters of vocational education. We are all striving to put together an educational program which can produce an employment opportunity for a hundred percent of our eighteen-year olds, rather than the present program which fails to educate almost twenty-five percent of them, at least to a level of adequate employability. Perhaps then we can stifle some of the disenchantment that we have amongst many of our youths today.

The first National Advisory Council report, in seeking an answer to education, culminating in adequate employment--and this is what we're talking about--diagnosed that at the very heart of our problem is a national attitude that says that vocational education is designed for somebody else's children.

I thought that this was a marvelous statement, because it pinpoints a good deal of the problem that we have had throughout the country in trying to get this as a viable alternative for a great number of kids who see nothing particularly advantageous in going through four years of college where they really don't know what they want to do when they go on.

It is also important from building up again our sense of skill and our sense of craftsmanship, which I think one of the things which we have had reactions from in the consumer sector, is the quality of products that are being produced and our ability to be able to satisfy consumers as well as create an employable situation for the unemployed.

I spoke about this and this concept that you so graphically put forward in my individual views on S659, which is the obvious, the Omnibus Education Bill. That Bill at that time dealt chiefly with post-secondary education and I spoke of the problem in that context, emphasizing that the enticing student-aid packages were not intended to be viewed as an unqualified endorsement of the value of our present university education system, and I warned that the conclusion of both the Newman Report on Higher Education, and the Quantity Commission Special Report on Higher Education, I warned in that that our society's head-long rush to mystically ordain higher education institutions is proving ineffective as an educational tour and in many ways is systematically killing off the necessary and previously necessary trades and careers, which literally built our country.

These reports, the Carnegie Report, the Newman Report, indicate that of the students who enrolled last fall, over sixty percent of them will fail to earn a Bachelor's Degree, and of those who proceed to graduate school, another fifteen percent will drop out before they obtain their secondary.

An even more important statistic is that over eighty percent of all secondary school students are enrolled in either a college preparatory course or a general curriculum designed to ready them for college attendance, yet no more than seventeen percent of those students will ever obtain a degree. Seventeen percent of them.

Last year more than eight hundred and fifty thousand students dropped out of elementary and secondary schools. This can be cured I believe as time goes on, but I'm not too sure of it; I hope so.

Labor Department statistics indicate that by 1980, eight of ten jobs in America will not require a four-year college diploma, but vocational training will be required.

According to the 1970 figures--and I'm talking about 14-24 year olds--white males with vocational training experienced an unemployment rate of 2.6 percent, while those without any training experienced 3.8 percent unemployment. For the blacks, the desparity was even greater, 1.9 percent, compared with 6.9 percent.

So, I think you can see the value of this and what is going to happen as we go on through the '70's and into the '80's. These figures present a compelling argument, it seems to me, for expanded vocational education programs to meet both the expanded job supply and the labor demand, but they represent only the end product of education or the lack of it. They cannot accurately indicate the total scope of a career education iceberg, which should begin with occupational awareness in elementary schools.

I want to talk a little bit, if I may, about S659. I can't issue any final statements and I probably shouldn't issue any, on what is going on in our conference report, but I'm going to do it anyhow.

They say that an Executive Session in the Senate is only as good as the next morning's newspaper, so I might just as well go ahead and tell you what's going on. I think it is safe to say that a very strong Federal effort will be authorized for career education. Keeping in mind that conference--and I want to repeat this--is subject to votes on the reconsideration, we have already had one of those already; to date, the conferees have extended and expanded vocational education for three additional years. They have approved new occupational and community college programs. They have created and elevated a more responsive Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education within the Office of Education.

In authorizing three additional years, the Conferees specifically approved Section 102B, special programs for the disadvantaged and sixty million dollars per year.

It is estimated that an additional fifty thousand youths and adults in the fiscal year 1971 were served because of this special authorization, including school dropouts, migrants, correctional inmates, under-educated and under-employed, American Indians, the Spanish speaking, inter-city inhabitants and those living in the depressed world areas. So obviously, this has been a great advantage and it will be approved and expanded.

Part D was extended for three years at $75,000,000 per year. It provides an authorization to stimulate exemplary programs which seek to create new ways to join school and the world of work. Fifty percent of each State's part of the allocation is reserved by the Commission of Education to support projects which have specified objectives. So, although you have an allocation to each State, fifty percent of that is reserved for the special projects programs.

Federally administered Part D funds now support 56 projects, one in each State and territory. The States use the remaining fifty percent of Part D allocations for the development and operation of exemplary programs defined to serve as models for use in vocational education programs.

Part D may be--and I say "may be"--the most appropriate piece of legislation now in the U.S. Office of Education, through which the present level of public enthusiasm and commitment to career education can be encouraged and maintained.

Part E of the Bulk Act authorizes grants for construction of equipment in operation of residential vocational and educational schools. This is being renewed in conference, even though it hasn't been funded in the past and I must say to you that I have much doubt it will be funded this year in the condition of the budget that we now have, but at least we are continuing the authorization so it will be there at such time as the need for it can be substantially backed up and approved before the Appropriations Committee.

Part F, the consumer and the homemaking education, was extended through the fiscal year '75, at $50,000,000 a year. This, as you know, cuts across all the socio-economic lives, cultural needs group, and a total of 2,932,000 men and women, in the fiscal year '71, were reached by this part of the program.

Part F has also stimulated new approaches in bringing consumer and home-making programs to target population in economically depressed areas. Construction is provided, as you well know, in mobile construction units, public housing centers, drop-in centers, centers for adolescent, pregnant girls and

centers for senior citizens. These are difficult; they are not always effective, but they have in many ways been one of the mechanisms by which we have been challenging the population to become part of this whole concept of improving themselves in their own dignity in the process of it.

Part G, the cooperative vocational education, was extended at $75,000,000 a year. Cooperative vocational education involves, as you also know, the direct participation of business and industrial community in carrying out the objectives of vocational and educational-type education. To me, it represents one of the most effective means available to schools to bring vitality and pertinence to the education process.

The procedure of combining in-school instruction with part-time employment is well established as a concept and has been extremely useful over the years. Congress, therefore, made cooperative education a priority to further development, and this was reflected in the separate organization for cooperative vocational education in Public Law 90-576, in 1968.

During the fiscal year '71, approximately 68,800 additional students were enrolled in cooperative programs as a result of Part G. Most of them were located in schools or at a grade level where cooperative experience had not been available before. The continued support of cooperative vocational education, under existing Part G provisions, will support career education teams now being woven into the fabric of the whole spectrum of education. The work study was extended at $45,000,000 a year. It is my hope that this will continue as well.

The Conferees have adopted language clarifying the coverage of industrial arts program. Now industrial arts is clearly an education of training program leading towards employment and occupation, thus qualifying for educational funds.

Also, we have included in this training for volunteer firemen. They are not gainfully employed as firemen, as we all know, but they are extremely important in many areas of our country, and these are included for the first time under the voc-ed program.

Eighty percent of the first year program, first year funds, are to be alloted to the States for planning, and the establishment or designation of an existing State agency to manage and administer the program.

The State Advisory Council for Vocational Education is the same as the Advisory Council for Occupational Education under the '63 Bulkhead Act. Among other things, planning funds can be utilized to strengthen State Advisory Councils on vocational education.

Authorizations after fiscal 1973 are to be utilized by the States to encourage the introduction of occupational education, counseling and placement in elementary and secondary schools and to expand and improve post-secondary occupational programs.

The new Community College Act will provide 15.7 million to be alloted to the State Commissions for development of a state-wide plan. To assist in the development of the state-wide plan, another advisory committee on community colleges will be established. Additional authorizations of fifty million for the fiscal '73; seventy-five million for fiscal '74; and a hundred and fifty million for fiscal '75, are to be alloted among the States for establishment of grants to new colleges, expansion grants to existing colleges and grants for leasing temporary facilities in conjunction with either establishment or expansion grants.

As principle, Federal building assistance will have come from ear-marked community college funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act. These funds, under the Occupational Act, are for the purchase of new equipment and renovation of existing facilities, but not for construction. Both the leasing grant and the establishment or expansion grant funds are available only on a rapidly declining four-year Federal share scale.

So, the States will have to put up more and more money as it goes on over to the local communities, as the Federal share declines. We created a Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, headed by a Grade 18 Deputy Commissioner.

Congress, generally, as you well know, is hesitant to mandate specific administrative structures. But, in this instance, it was felt that in order to demonstrate congressional intent of importance and to place adult, vocational and technical education on a plane equal to higher education, we thought the action was necessary.

Practically speaking, it means that the Deputy Commissioner for the Bureau will be directly under the Commissioner of Education, rather than under the Deputy Commissioner for School Systems.

Now the impact of the new community college and occupational education programs is obviously uncertain at this time. The vital role, however, played by voc-ed serves as an indication of what we might reasonably expect from similar programs, particularly occupational education.

Vocational education progress, largely attributable to the '63 Act and the '68 Amendments, show that voc-ed enrollments increased from 3.7 million in 1960 to 7.7 million in 1970. During the last half of the '60's, enrollment grew 62 percent, compared with 47 percent for the '60-'64 period.

Enrollment projections show that in 1975, over half of the nation's secondary school population will be enrolled in vocational education. Largely responsible for this increased enrollment pattern are the combined expenditures by Federal, State and local agencies for programs in the field. For example, for every Federal dollar provided by the '68 Amendments, during fiscal '70, the State and local agencies contributed five dollars and 14 cents, or five times what we did at the Federal level.

This equated to a 1.5 million of State and local money; 300,000,000 of Federal funds, for a total of 1.8 million expenditures for vocational education programs. It represents a total increase of over one billion dollars over the approximate $800,000,000 expended in '66, and that again shows that tremendous emphasis has been placed on it.

I would say to you without the money provided by the Vocational Education Act, it is doubtful that many of the State and local agencies would have charged such large amounts into this. Results can best be evaluated in terms of completion and job placement.

1970 enrollment figures exemplify the success of the program. You will remember a total of 7.7 million was given earlier; of this, 1.2 million completed voc-ed programs in areas of agriculture, distribution and marketing, health education, home economics, office education, technical education and industry education.

In addition, 84,200 students left prior to normal completion with marketable skills. Consequently, during that particular year a total of 1,358,000 and more than that, people were prepared to enter the skilled labor market as a direct result of voc-ed programs generated through the Federal dollar of the '68 Amendments.

We can appreciate these accomplishments, but I can assure you that continuation of the Act assures the success of many who must rely on occupational education as they prepare for the future.

It is estimated that enrollment in secondary, post-secondary and adult education programs, including the disadvantaged and the handicapped, will total 13.6 millions students by 1978. Continuation of the Act, thus, contributes to the abatement of dependency and helps meet the vocational and education and economic needs of the people.

I submit to you that this is only the beginning. With our new legislation and with our wise guidance, we can achieve equally blended and academic vocational education programs, void of discrimination which we have had in the past. As I said earlier, we have had a problem in many ways in trying to convince people that voc-ed and occupational education is for their children and not just for someone else's.

It reminds me a little bit of the mass transit authority, everybody comes in and they are all in favor of the mass transit, but the general feeling is that mass transit will clear the road so they can drive their own car to work. This is very similar to the voc-ed, and unless we can change the emphasis and philosophy of many people along these lines to reinculcate the skill and the pride that we have in craftsmanship and good jobs, we are going to continue to have problems in getting this as really one of the key elements in our elementary, secondary and two-year college systems.

I appreciate all of the support that you have given us in this effort, and I can assure you that I will continue working on it.

Thank you.

MR. PETER P. MUIRHEAD, EXECUTIVE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, USOE

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

Good morning. Mr. Hall, I want to remind you that I am Scot and that my Scottish mother once told me, "Peter, look out for perfume." She said, "It is all right to spray it, but don't swallow it."

I am indeed delighted to be here and I think, of course, it is going to be difficult to follow the act that the Senator put on. That was really one to top them all, but I bring you greetings.

I arrived late last evening and I was ever so disappointed to have missed what I am sure has been the highlight of the conference--an evening with the Coors. Incidentally, as we discuss career education, wasn't it significant that we learned this morning that the hand that controls the water faucet controls the World.

This is an important meeting of important people on a very important subject. I welcome the opportunity to participate.

When the members of the National Council come together with their sister and brother members in the various States and put the topic of Career Education as high on your working agenda as you have--that's good news, indeed.

I think also when people of your proven ability and leadership are in the vanguard of support for this movement, we are really rolling out the big guns, if you will, in support of a very important movement in this Country.

I think that it will come as no surprise to you to learn that I can think of no concept more worthy of your endorsement and more worthy of your responsibility than career education-- the idea that education has an obligation to acquaint every youngster with the many career options available in this diverse economy of ours and help each one find and prepare for the right career.

I commend the National Council and I commend all of the State Councils, not only for their service to education which has been illustrious, but even more importantly for their understanding of the problems that confront both education and the larger society and for their creativity and wisdom in helping to devise proposals that will provide, hopefully, solutions to some of those problems.

Perhaps because this meeting is being held in Denver, I am reminded of a man who developed his home-grown brand of wit and wisdom in the West. This man, working with little more than innate talent and an eye for the humorous side, and honing this talent on the sensibilities of politicians, became World famous and the highest paid performer of his time. I'm speaking, of course, of Will Rogers. Yet, looking back, he said, "The thing I'm sorriest about in my life is that I didn't stay around to take on the fifth grade."

Many young people seem to stay around to take on the fifth grade today and four or five or more grades after that, simply because compulsory education attendance laws say they have to stay. Many linger on in school after the compulsory attendance years, still without purpose or sense of direction. This is documented all too pointedly poignantly by the record.

Despite our concerted efforts in recent years to make education more relevant for the children and young people in our schools and colleges and vocational centers and technical institutions, education today fails to prepare nearly one-third of the 3.7 million youngsters who leave formal education each year for life as productive and self-fulfilling adults.

I'm not going to outrage you this morning with the dreary statistics to back that up, but just let me say that a budget in the United States of $85 million is used to support education, and there is ample evidence to indicate that one-third of the young people obtaining those services are not being well served.

One-third of an $85 billion dollar budget, and then you try to include the millions of drop-outs and billions of dollars mis-spent in the past, the losses really make us wonder about our sense of value.

The losses underscore what Senator Van Alstyne was saying this morning. What we can never, of course, recover are the personal losses of these young people--their frustrations, their shattered hopes and dreams. Nor can we calculate the contribution that they might have made to our national vitality and progress.

After they have spent much of their adult life in dull dead-end jobs, I believe that many of them will be ready to paraphrase Will Roger's lament. I think they will ask why education failed to motivate them in the fifth grade

and subsequent years. I think they will want to know why academic offerings, vital as they are in developing problem-solving skills and a philosophy of life, were not more closely keyed to the real world of work, recreation and self-involvement.

Unless we move ahead rapidly with the integration of career education with academic preparation all along the line, and that is the essence of career education, I'm afraid that yet another generation will have the same dismal legitimate claims against the educational system.

I'm sure that this group more than most would agree that there must be a better way, and that that way has to be planned and available to all.

That leads me to say that career education is an idea whose time has come. It means bringing career awareness down into the elementary grades. It means giving youngsters the desire and motivation to aim for a career that excites them. It means preparing them to leave high school with a marketable skill or to complete work in college or a technical institute or an area vocational, technical school with a more advanced skill.

It will require and it does require a concerted effort by schools and post-secondary education institutions to key all of these activities to the labor market as it will exist when these students are ready to enter. In short, career education should become an integral part of the educational system.

Now in addition to your long-standing commitment to the value of training young people for the world of work, the career education concept has acquired some rather impressive endorsements in recent months. President Nixon called for a new emphasis on career education in his State of the Union message to the Congress. This is what the President said: "There is no more disconcerting waste than the waste of human potential. And there is no better investment than an investment in human fulfillment. Career education can help make education and training more meaningful for the student, more rewarding for the teacher, more available to the adult, more relevant for the disadvantaged and more productive for our Country."

You and I hear constantly that career education is not synonymous with--or another name for vocational education. And that's true. But let me add, and I can probably say this with better grace than most of you, let me add that career education without vocational education would be as useless as an automobile without an engine.

President Nixon said that much more eloquently than I said it. In an official White House proclamation for Vocational Education Week, the President said: The vocational educator can take satisfaction from the fact that the new

concept of career education derives its heart and energy from the effort so carefully begun by the vocational and technical teachers of America.

I mentioned that we have an impressive list of commitments and endorsements supplementing the fine work that you have done. We have, in the Office of Education, also worked for several months in close cooperation with the Chief State School Officers, with university-based research centers, with representatives of school districts, and professional education associations, to try to develop a first approximation, if you will, of what career education could, not necessarily should, be.

Last January, Commissioner Marland named an Office of Education Task Force to direct the growing Federal involvement, both in the basic development and research aspects, and in support of pilot programs in selected school systems. I was honored to be appointed Chairman of that task force and I can report to you now that we have a good deal of confidence, that we will be able to identify the inputs that are needed for determining how the Office of Education should direct its limited Career Education resources--$114 million this fiscal year, and if Congress approves our request, that will be increased to $168 million for the upcoming fiscal 1973.

We expect this task force to do a number of things, and let me share them with you: One, to develop a sharper definition of career education.

Secondly, to identify what additional research is needed and how we can track the progress of that research.

Third, to identify what the Office can do to export, if you will, good ideas on career education to other school systems and communities.

Fourth, to come forward with a plan for organizing the Office of Education so that it will be engaged in all of its parts in the growing career education movement.

Fifth, put into place the very important legislation that is now before the Congress establishing a Deputy for Occupational Education in the Office of Education.

Now I know that at this conference, your deliberations will generate new ideas and they certainly need to be made part of the National dialogue. As I'm sure you may have already concluded, despite the spontaneous endorsement of the career education concept and despite the promising efforts to bring the idea to actual practice, a number of important questions concerning the career education concept remain to be resolved.

We have found, as I'm sure that you have found, that our words in support of career education are not keeping pace with our ability to deliver practical applications of career education in the schools.

Let me take just a moment to clarify for you what seems to be an emerging consensus about some of the aspects of career education, and then perhaps in our back and forth, let's spend some time on those aspects on which there is something considerably less than a consensus.

- career education is not merely a new name for what we have always called vocational education

- career education is for every child: rich, poor, suburban, urban, rural; beginning in his first school year and following him as far as he goes in the education system

- career education is a way to provide career awareness in the early grades and career preparation in the upper grades that continues at an ever-increasing level of sophistication until every student is equipped to enter the occupation of his choice--limited only by his personal ability

- career education must include vocational education because we estimate that nearly all of our school youth should develop salable skills while in school, whether or not they proceed beyond high school, in a wholly different field. The options are always open

- career education is not only for children and young adults; it is also for persons of all ages, for anyone who wants to enhance his occupational and earning potential, or to develop himself more fully in any way

Two of the four Research and Development models for Career Education developed by the Office of Education are pointed specifically toward adults.

- career education favors no ethnic group to the exclusion of any other. It simply recognizes that concentration and motivation need to be ignited early in life--rekindled later--so that every individual can pursue the occupation and life style of his or her choice

- career education is not a rigid program from which no State or school district or adult training effort can deviate; every State, every community, has a population, an occupation market and an educational system that differs in some degree from every other; career education is flexible and can be molded to the unique needs of every State and community

career education is not a restructuring of education that will bankrupt our citizenry; true, startup costs in schools should be somewhat higher than present per-pupil costs. These costs would include the addition of many more guidance counselors and the retraining of those we have to bring career orientation down to the elementary grades and to pay for higher cost of the skill development training equipment needed for secondary and post-secondary level

I should like to emphasize particularly the need for redirective guidance and counseling, at all levels, as we develop this concept of Career Education because in order for an individual to choose a career, he must first know how to make occupational decisions based upon the knowledge and understanding of occupational opportunities.

A full 12 years ago the distinguished educator, James B. Conant, recommended in The American High School Today: "that our high schools have one vocational counselor for every 250 to 300 students . . . We also urgently need in our high schools far more emphasis on group counseling to make the best possible use of the limited personnel, far more emphasis on counseling those not college-bound and on educating girls and minority members to the full range of opportunities ahead of them if they have the right education-training." Conant was speaking ahead of his time. But surely his time is now. Before educators can move effectively, however, we Americans need to re-examine--as parents, taxpayer, legislators, and businessmen--some of the "self-evident truths" that have long governed our thinking and our pocketbooks regarding the relationship between education and the whole business of job training and career advancement. Indeed, the consensus already building suggests that many of these "truths" have outlived their time and that some were never really self-evident in the first place. Let's look at some of them.

First, "give students a thorough academic grounding and careers will take care of themselves. The public record is replete with evidence that this is not true today! Careers do not just happen; they must be planned. Occupational choice, and specific skills training, must be part of the total career plan for each individual.

Second, dropouts are low achievers who are not going to make it in a technological society anyway. Not so. Dropout rates have little to do with ability. For example, Louisville, Kentucky had 1,900 of its 15,000 secondary students drop out in a single year. Looking for reasons, the school system found that only 4 percent quit because they had to go to work; 6 percent could not make it academically; over 50 percent left due to lack of interest.

Third, the study of grammar, English literature, geometry, have no career relevance for today's students. Those of you in business, industry and labor can help tremendously by going into classrooms and telling students how your

own studies of these subjects contributed to your career decisions and advancement. This does not mean that schooling should not include the learning it does at present. It does not mean that education's main aim should no longer be developing the student's ability to think and to reason. It does mean that a student should have the chance to learn about the world of work and what he can do in it and how he can prepare for it. He must have the opportunity to make that specific preparation. And most important of all, the basic learnings in the arts and humanities take on a new relevance, and provide an individualized motivation for the learner.

Fourth, you need a Bachelor's degree to perform entry level professional and managerial tasks. Although many business firms seem to believe this, as evidenced by their hiring practices, it is increasingly obvious that this policy is counter-productive. We frustrate many young college graduates by hiring them to handle largely routine assignments. And we lose many good people who are barred from a chance to demonstrate their abilities because they do not have a college diploma. Remember that such creative geniuses as Thomas Edison had only three months of formal schooling in a life-time and that David Sarnoff, who pioneered RCA's telecommunications breakthroughs, left school at age 15. Unless business takes a hard look at its credentialing requirements, another Edison or Sarnoff may never be given a chance. Parents, civic leaders, legislators, and other decision-makers take their cue from business and support the degree syndrome. We see parents making financial commitments, even sacrifices, in the neighborhood of $10,000 or more to put each child through college--even those who do not belong there. We need, therefore, to re-assess as a society the function of education in preparing our youth both for productive careers and rewarding lives.

In closing, I want again to commend you for bringing about a public awareness of career education concepts. I hope that you will return to the busy lives that you do conduct and to your States and your communities and your associations and your institutions, and work to advance the design and installation of career education programs that will help every youngster to find his place in the world of work.

Those of us who have chosen education as a career, but even more importantly those of you who have chosen education because you love it, we need all of the help that we can get. That's not a new situation, but it has an even more urgent ring today, more than ever before.

Education is asked to deal with the hopes and dreams and inner turmoil and the insecurities and the abilities and shortcomings of the young and to help each youngster to find his way to adulthood. In the increasingly complex world, we will also need to prepare him for a career that he wants and he can handle. I think this is a moral and ethical commitment that no one takes lightly.

Today more than ever, we know that no man is an island. George Bernard Shaw may have said it best when he said: "Independence, that's a middle class blasphemy. We are all dependent on one another, every sole of us on Earth." Thank you.

MR. MICHAEL RUSSO, ACTING DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

It is a pleasure to be here and visit with the many people I have had the opportunity to work with in this State and the other States represented at this meeting.

We have had the opportunity these past few years to analyze the State plan and we have revised the plan in order to make it a timely planning document. This task has been accomplished and the guides will soon be available for all of you.

Due to the shortage of time, I will move through this explanation very rapidly, however, I would like to make one statement which is somewhat removed from the topic, State Plan Guide. We have recently concluded a three-day annual conference of the State Directors of Vocational Education of this country. I am looking forward to the day when the State Directors will attend this conference and have with them as a member of the team a representative of his State Advisory Council.

This meeting is used as a platform, not only to bring forth the general concerns as they exist throughout the States, but also in turn to inform the participants of the sense of direction, goals, and aspirations which we in Washington see emanating from the Congress, the Administration, and the entire country.

I look upon this meeting and your individualized State Advisory meetings as being extremely valuable in terms of the contributions you can collectively make toward the betterment of Vocational-Technical Education.

We desperately need your input and follow-up on the multitude of critical issues we face and I would welcome receiving through your National Advisory Council your views and comments. I implore you not to fall into the "trap" that many of us do, whereby we talk to each other within our own particular areas of interest and fail to convey our concerns into other channels. Too often due to this lack of communication, minor problems become major ones

the format made it very difficult to follow the cash flow and its impact on the communities and the people we are attempting to serve

The Fiscal Year 1973 State Plan Guide has been developed with the following objectives:

I. Improvement of the State plan as a planning instrument
   A. The new format will:
      1. Organize planning and budgeting data in a logical sequence to facilitate decision-making and indicate the goals, objectives, outcomes, activities, and funding level projected to provide vocational and technical education for all who need and desire such training.

      2. Display data in relation to the target areas and target populations specified in the legislation.

      3. Reduce the amount of narrative writing required.

   Integration of the vocational education State plan and the EPDA Supplement into one plan.
   A. The combining of the two documents will:
      1. Eliminate duplication and reduce the amount of narrative writing.

      2. Provide uniform data for both BAVTE and BEPD concerning professional personnel preparation and development.

   Consideration of National and State Advisory Council Recommendations
   A. The addition of an assurance form will provide a written record of consideration the State has given the State Advisory Council recommendation.

   Both Part I-Administration Provisions and Part II-Annual and Long-Range Program Plan Provisions will be submitted for Fiscal Year 1973. Only amendments reflecting changes in Part I will need to be submitted in the future.

On the 14th of February 1972, we sent out a memorandum to all State Directors of Vocational Education and to the Regional Offices in which we stated that the new proposed guidelines should be used in developing FY 1973 State plans. In order to implement the guidelines and to initiate the people to the changes, we sent two teams throughout the country to explain the procedures and the planning "flow" we were striving to see in their respective State plans. Now for the first time on a national basis, each State plan can be analyzed relative to anticipated expectations and goals to be attained both annually and on a long-term basis. We will have now started to develop an accountability situation which in the past realistically did not exist.

and major problems become almost insurmountable. This, I believe, we must strive to accomplish if we intend to maximize our total efforts for the promotion of vocational education.

Too often planning has been developed in a vacuum with percentages applied using some rule of thumb for rationale. There was no follow-up or evaluation relative to the validity of the plan and too often the annual and long-range plan were "rediscovered" each year. Now we are striving to correct this method of planning so it can have a "flow" and will truly meet the needs as they arise. Quite simply, I am also stating that we as educators are utilizing public taxes which were entrusted to us to invest into educational programs to meet the needs of all the people in the community. We in turn must give the public a just educational return for the monies. They are entitled to know what they have purchased and what they should expect in the way of programmatic output. This can only be accomplished by a very realistic review, interpretation, programming of a long-range plan.

When we looked at the State plan guide and its implementation, we uncovered a number of disturbing things.

- too often we found a great gap between the programmatic content and the labor market needs
- too often due to an inadequate data system, the plan was based on too many assumptions
- too often the margin or percentage factors derived from the assumptions each year created a greater lack of reliability as we compounded the initial problem
- the citizens we serve are becoming more concerned with our educational systems and want to know very factually what is being advocated and why and too often we could not build a sound base or rationale to justify the proposed expenditures. It is very evident that we no longer can tolerate "horseback estimates"
- too often part two and part three of the plan was a duplication of rhetoric with some change of data
- part two (annual) was too often developed in isolation from part three (long-range) which poses a question: how can we project our five-year period with any degree of validity if we don't look at both annual and long-range as one continuous document?
- due to the nature of funding EPDA this required a separate document, which of necessity required a tremendous amount of duplication of information developed for parts two and three

MR. REGINALD PETTY, RESEARCH SPECIALIST, NACVE STAFF

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

First, I would like to say that I have never worked with a more creative group of people than those who are my bosses on the National Advisory Council, nor have I met a finer group of people than those I have met in the States, the various state directors, state executive directors, National Council Directors, and members of the state advisory committees.

I think I have to name a couple of you, Mrs. Vieregg of Nebraska, who is one of the most interesting persons I have ever come in contact with. People like Max Jobe. It has been a fantastic experience for me since September.

I would also like to say that we appreciate the cooperation we have had from the State Advisory Councils with your reports, even though some of them have been a bit late. We understand the reasons for that.

First, let me go over briefly the logic or rationale, or whatever you want to call it that I was using when looking at the State Advisory Council reports. I tried to view them first in terms of to what extent the logic within the reports was consistent. In other words, given the recommendations that were included in all the reports, I tried to find out the type of background information data actually used in reaching the recommendations. In most cases, you could tell.

So, I think of this in terms of, if you want to use the phrase, internal consistency. I tried to look at it in this regard, thinking that the public who will be reading the reports also would want to know how these recommendations were reached.

I also tried to determine to what extent the outline that was determined by the Ad Hoc Committee was in fact followed. In about a third of the cases, it was followed completely. About another third, all of the information that

was requested in the outline was in the report, though the actual outline wasn't followed as such. In about a third of the cases, the outline was not followed.

I have been talking to the various executive directors about why, in the cases it was not followed. In many cases the reasons were absolutely valid.

I would say at this point that to do a national summary of all the reports is extremely difficult if you have a whole series of different kinds of outlines that are used. So I would suggest wherever possible, whenever possible, to follow the outline. If you can't, we will certainly understand that, too.

In general, the reports were very, very good. I want to put in a plea here that the comments that I included with the reports be taken as comments from an outsider, who was looking at the reports in isolation, who in some cases was unaware of some of the reasons the report was developed as it was.

So please remember that my comments and fifteen cents get you a cup of coffee.

I suppose now that all of the executive directors have received copies of the summaries. Is this true? That's good. If you have any comments or any concerns about the reports, please give me a call or get in touch with me and let me know.

I also would like some feedback from you on what you thought of the format used. I am not terribly satisfied with it, but I am not quite sure what other format would result in improvement. So, if you have any ideas about additional type of outlines or additional way of going about summarizing these reports, please let me know because it will be appreciated.

I have listed some of the concerns that I derived from the reports:

One, there were some reports which were contracted out which, in reading, it became difficult to determine to what extent the advisory council itself was involved in the evaluation.

In all the cases where they were contracted out, I was aware of the involvement of the council and knew that council was in fact involved.

But, in reading the report in isolation, because of the way it was written by the contractor, you weren't really able to determine to what extent the advisory council was involved. Therefore, an outsider reading it, people in Congress reading it, would probably ask what the advisory council was doing.

So this is just a suggestion: when you contract out a report, make sure that whoever does it reflects the input of the advisory council, because this is important.

Secondly, too, as I mentioned before, I think it does help if enlisting the recommendations you do show how the recommendations were reached, or what kind of information you used, what kind of concerns existed that resulted in these kinds of recommendations.

We have gotten some feedback from some people who did ask how these recommendations were reached. And, in some cases, you couldn't really tell.

With the concerns also, as many people notice from my listing of the concerns in the reports, I tried to be as honest as I could because I had met most of you and I felt that the relationships were such that I could be honest. I hope in many cases I wasn't too hard on anybody. This was not the National Advisory Council evaluation of the report. It was just the fact that many people had asked what we thought of their reports, and this is an attempt to respond to that.

Because many of the state council members may not have had an opportunity to see the reports, as I am sure most of you just received them last week, I would like to read a couple of paragraphs which give you an over-all summary of the recommendations.

The two most frequently mentioned topics in the '71 recommendations were the need for more funds in twenty-four States, and the desire to implement a comprehensive career education program, twenty-two States. In the '70 reports, the category which included funding was tense.

The funding--concern for funding moved from tenth to first. This change may reflect the disappointments of many state councils on the level of funding provided last year.

Career education as a separate topic did not appear in last year's tally. This new priority of the Office of Education, it seems, is being well and widely received.

Counseling programs and information systems were items one and two in the 1970 tally. They were items three and four in the 1971 list of recommendations, showing consistent concern and continuing need in both areas.

The fifth 1971 item was programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped, up from seventh place last year.

Placement and follow-up came in sixth both this year and last. Seventh in the 1971 was in-service training for teachers and administrators, down from third rank in 1970.

Two items which were high on the list in 1970 and dropped way down in 1971 were evaluation, fourth place to seventeenth place, and planning fifth place to tenth place. This could be a reflection of success in making improve-

ments in these two important areas, and interpretation which would be in accord with references to progress elsewhere in many reports.

However, while fifteen States mentioned that their state plans were not yet satisfactory documents, many still lacked clearly stated goals and objectives, making evaluation or program success difficult.

I am sure all of the state advisory council members will have access to the summaries that were sent out. And, again, I would like to request feedback from you concerning any area, any aspect, of the report.

Thank you.

LAWRENCE DAVENPORT, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Remarks Before the Joint Meeting of the State and National Advisory Councils

Whenever I begin to talk about vocational education, I seem to get a little long-winded, and this becomes one of the problems.

The activities of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education through the past couple of months and year has been very promising for us. As for specific activities, we have been involved with the Air Force Community College in San Antonio, Texas.

Every Air Force man who enters the service will be provided with an educational jacket which will follow him through his Air Force career, and it will be possible for him to learn technology in the Air Force Community College which will be home based in Texas.

We have been working with the United States Chamber of Commerce in order to involve them in a better relationship with business in the educational profession.

We have been working with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Census, and United States Office of Education, coordinating efforts to make manpower and labor statistics for guidance and counseling.

You will be receiving a report very shortly, our sixth report, which is entitled Guidance and Counseling. It has hosted numerous meetings with professional and other community organizations such as NAACP, APGA, AFL-CIO, PTA, National Association of Manufacturers, Manpower Administration, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and many more.

We have also issued, and I would hope you have already read, our Veterans Report--a special report on veterans.

We have coordinated with book publishers, working with them, trying to improve vocational education classroom material.

And we have been working with various State governors to improve the image of veterans getting occupational training.

We provided resource material to Congress, working with Congressional committees to develop new legislation in vocational education and manpower areas.

We have also provided resource material information to the White House and Congress for speeches and positions on vocational education.

We have also worked with the Department of Defense in the role of vocational education and civilian opportunities for recruiting for all-volunteer army, and the transition for servicemen leaving the military.

We have also worked with the Department of Justice, helping revise educational programs and training opportunities for prison inmates.

I just wanted to give you some of the highlights of some of the things that the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education has been concerning itself with over the past year, and will continue to concern itself with.

Some of the States that are involved in our public information project are: Maine, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Delaware, Georgia, Florida, Ohio, Indiana and Oregon. The States which are planning or are in the process now of developing films are Connecticut, Tennessee, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, Texas, Montana, Colorado, California, and South Dakota.

And I think one of the things which we are also very proud of is we have been able to accomplish working with the House Education Committee in making changes in the state plan. Those of you who have been following this will find next year's state plan to be a much better planning document instead of a form that you will fill out that goes on the shelf in Washington, D.C.

On behalf of the National Advisory Council, we are very happy to be here today. If there is anything we can do to help you in the next year, don't hesitate to call on us.

LIST OF DELEGATES IN ATTENDANCE

ATTENDANCE FOR NACVE/SACVE MEETING on MAY 4-6, 1972

ALABAMA
Richard Baker
Henry Morgan

ALASKA
Louis Licari

AMERICAN SAMOA
Loi Pio

ARIZONA
Augustus Shaw
F. R. Vihel

ARKANSAS
Lanny Hassell

CALIFORNIA
Karl Kolb

COLORADO
Mrs. Harold Amick
A. W. Bevan
I. I. Boltz
John Cameron
Leo Davey
John Haberbosch
Alden Knapp
George Lyon
Irwin A. MacKay
Robert Martinez
Dr. W. L. McDivitt
James Murray
Sebastian Owens
David Rice
Stow Witwer

CONNECTICUT
Douglas Fellows
Wallace Fletcher
Bernard Shelton
Barbara Southworth

DELAWARE
Robert DuHadaway

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Rev. Ernest Gibson
Mrs. Carolyn Parker

FLORIDA
James Ghiotto
John Hinman
Bruce Howell

GEORGIA
Don Cargill
R. H. Hudson
Hearn Lumpkin
Charles McDaniel
Olin Newby
Richard Owens

HAWAII
George Ikeda
David Thompson

IDAHO
Vernon Exner

INDIANA
Francis Morrison
Walter Penrod
Norm Taylor

IOWA
Harlan Giese
Robert Skinner

KENTUCKY
Ed Brandon
Billy Howard

LOUISIANA
Robert Lee

MAINE
Harold Noddin

MARYLAND
Max Jobe

MASSACHUSETTS
Robert Albert
Richard Brown
Leo Renaud
Adalberth Rozario
Fred Tarbox

MICHIGAN
Arthur Shack
Joseph Tuma

MINNESOTA
George DeLong
Jerry Enright
Ron Hale

MISSISSIPPI
Benny Curtis

MISSOURI
Jim Castleberry
Afton Bridges
B. Bruns
Gordon Kutscher
D. Ross
Arthur Shropshire

MONTANA
William Ball
Carl Blaskovich, Jr.
Dick Draper
Jack Gunderson
Gregory Hamlin
William Korizek
Wes Lambert
Frank Peterson

MONTANA (cont'd)
Joe Renders
Linda Skaar

NEBRASKA
Donald Bastemeyer
C. A. Cromer
Emmett Lee
Virginia Vieregg

NEVADA
Max Blackham
Jon V. Krug

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Andrew Moynihan
Paul Goldsmith

NEW JERSEY
R. Girandola
J. W. Helmstaedter

NEW MEXICO
Suzanne Boyd
Peter Eissele

NEW YORK
George Allen
John Briscoe

NORTH CAROLINA
Thomas King

NORTH DAKOTA
Winston Dolve
Mrs. Ray Miller

OHIO
Joseph Hall
Dean Simeral

OKLAHOMA
Mike Arnett
Roy Craig
Orbra Hulsey
Roy Stewart
Lawrence Thompson

OREGON
Jerry Haggin
Dr. Floyd Stearns

PENNSYLVANIA
George Elison
George Schaffer

PUERTO RICO
Jose Lopez

RHODE ISLAND
Robert Rahill

SOUTH CAROLINA
Dr. R. White
Isaac Williams

SOUTH DAKOTA
Phylis Dixon
Jon Merchant

TENNESSEE
Lowery Beck
Jack Carr

TEXAS
Elton Thomas
Marcos Vann

UTAH
Fritz Hinckley
Dean McDonald
Richard Prows
Garland Puzey

VERMONT
Richard Collins
Pelton Goudey

VIRGINIA
Rufus Beamer
Arthur Walker

WASHINGTON
R. H. Putman
J. Alan Duncan

WEST VIRGINIA
B. Bradford
Fred Hoke

WISCONSIN
John Kramer
Mrs. William Nielsen

WYOMING
James Anderson
Leo Breeden
George Ewan
Gaylord Hanson
Clinton Harris
Ivan Million
Charles Newton
Charles Tyler
James Zancanella

NATIONAL COUNCIL
David Van Alstyne, Jr.
Mrs. Louis Bachman
Lowell Burkett
Frank Cannizzaro
Mrs. Joseph Coors
Lawrence Davenport
Calvin Dellefield
Mrs. Hugh Hughes
Duane Lund
Donald McDowell
Luis Morton
Norman Stanger
Joanne Cullen
Steve Stocks
Delfino Valdez

GSA DC 73-1039

OTHER PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL:

- First Report - directed its comments and recommendations at the need for change in national attitudes towards vocational education

- Second Report- recommended that the Federal government make necessary policy changes in its approaches to funding, in the organization and role of the Office of Education, and in present and proposed manpower policies and legislation

- Third Report - challenged American education to deal with the needs of the disadvantaged and minorities who do not enjoy adequate educational opportunities

- Fourth Report- turned its attention to five unique problems of financing and planning vocational education programs

- Fifth Report - attacked the educational establishment for paying lip service only to career education concepts rather than implementing realistic programs

- Sixth Report - calls for the need to improve and expand counseling and guidance services throughout the country to assist young people in making rational and informed educational and career choices

- Special Report-Employment Problems of the Vietnam Veteran, urged new efforts to meet the training and employment needs of returning veterans

- Proceedings of Joint Meetings with the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education.

  Cooperative Day of Planning I (no longer in print)

  Cooperative Day of Planning II (May 1-2, 1970 - Washington, D.C.)

  Cooperative Day of Planning III (November 6-7, 1970 - Washington, D.C.)

  Cooperative Day of Planning IV (April 17-18, 1971 - San Antonio, Texas)

  Cooperative Day of Planning V (November 12-13, 1971 - Washington, D.C.)

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education
425 13th Street, N.W., Suite 852
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 962-0781